

## 10

Three Notes on *Habeo* and *Ac* in the  
*Itinerarium Egeriae*

CLIFFORD WEBER

I. *Habeo* = *Habito* (20. 7)

The frequentative *habito* is the usual Latin word for “reside,” but in pre-Classical texts this idea is occasionally expressed by the simplex *habeo*. Of the latter usage there is one example in the third-century *Sacra Argeorum* quoted by Varro,<sup>1</sup> but otherwise it is limited to drama: nine times in Plautus,<sup>2</sup> twice in Naevius, and once each in Accius and Afranius. By 100 B.C., however, this usage would appear to have become obsolete, for not only is it never attested in any Classical text, but subsequently the grammarian pseudo-Placidus states that *habeo* = “reside” “nunc frequentative tantum dicitur.”<sup>3</sup> In Late Latin, to be sure, isolated examples are to be found: one in Apuleius,<sup>4</sup> one in Dictys Cretensis, and one in Paulinus of Nola. Nevertheless, two examples drawn from a poet and from an archaizer like Apuleius are not sufficient to establish the survival of *habeo* = *habito* in post-Classical Latin, nor is an isolated instance in Dictys.<sup>5</sup> A search for additional late examples, moreover, would not appear to hold much promise. In the entry on *habeo* in the *Thesaurus Linguae*

<sup>1</sup> *Ling.* 5. 50.<sup>2</sup> Textual conjectures would add three more examples in *Curc.* 44, *Men.* 308, and *Poen.* 1093.<sup>3</sup> Lindsay, *Glossaria Latina*, IV (Paris 1930), H 15 (p. 64).<sup>4</sup> Two if *habeo* in *Apol.* 21 (p. 25. 4 van der Vliet) is intransitive.<sup>5</sup> The same goes for *CIL*, VI, 38274 from Etruria, which is of unknown date and in any case displays a modicum of literary knowledge.

*Latinae*<sup>6</sup> the lexicographer unequivocally declares, "Locos dedi omnes."

In *Itinerarium Egeriae* 20. 7, however, this sentence is found:

... mox de nocte petierunt heremum et unusquisque eorum monasteria sua, qui ubi habebat.

As long ago as 1912, in his review of Löfstedt's commentary on the *Itinerarium*,<sup>7</sup> Schmalz recognized (without, however, expressly drawing attention to the fact) that in this passage *habebat* is best taken to mean "reside." Otherwise, an ellipse of *monasterium suum* must be assumed. Thus, whatever may be the correct analysis of *qui ubi* in the above sentence, there can be little doubt about the equivalence of *habebat* to *habitabat*, so that *qui ubi habebat* means something like "each wherever he happened to be living," as Schmalz took it. This instance in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 20. 7 should be added, then, to the examples of *habeo* = *habito* cited in the *Thesaurus*, "locos dedi omnes" notwithstanding. Another fact, however, is more important. Taken together with Dictys Cretensis 4. 15, this passage demonstrates that *habeo* = "reside" was still in current use as late as the late A.D. 300s. Thus, as it appears in Apuleius and Paulinus of Nola, this usage is not a case of literary affectation but is rather current idiom. It also affords an especially clear illustration of the so-called "classical gap." Amply attested in pre-Classical drama, *habeo* = "reside" then disappears from view for the next two centuries, but not because it became obsolete. On the contrary, though rejected by Classical and Silver purists, the use of *habeo* in this sense lived in the non-literary language of everyday life.<sup>8</sup> This is the reason why it reappears in Late Latin, after the breakdown of the complex stylistic canon which had earlier distinguished everyday speech from acceptable literary usage.

## II. *Ibi Habet* = *Il y a* (4. 4)

It is common knowledge that the impersonal use of *habet* with an accusative, first appearing in Late Latin in the A.D. 300s, is the linguistic ancestor of French *il y a* ("there is," "there are") and the parallel expressions in Spanish (*hay*), Catalan (*hi ha*), and Italian (*vi ha*, *ci ha*). In the French expression the adverb *y* is optional until the

<sup>6</sup> Col. 2401. 13.

<sup>7</sup> *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 32 (1912), 549–61.

<sup>8</sup> Löfstedt implicitly recognized this fact in *Eranos* 7 (1907), 67, where he has this comment on Dictys Cretensis 4. 15: "Dass *habere* = *habitare* bei einem Spätlateiner nicht beanstandet werden darf, braucht kaum hervorgehoben zu werden." How, four years later, did he miss the same usage in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 20. 7?

1700s, but in all the languages preserving impersonal *habet* + acc., examples containing this adverb or one of its cognates are attested from the earliest period on.<sup>9</sup> Of *ibi habet*, however, the primordial Latin expression, only one example has been identified, and that, found in chapter 19 (p. 145. 19 Geyer) of Theodosius' *De situ terrae sanctae*, is no earlier than the A.D. 500s:

*ibi habet dactalum Nicolaum maiorem, ibi et Moyses de saeculo transivit, et ibi aquas calidas sunt ubi Moyses lavit et in ipsas aquas calidas leprosi curantur.*

It is clear, moreover, that even in this passage *ibi habet* is far from being a fixed expression. Impersonal *habet* is here only one of the three verbs which are used with *ibi*, the full semantic value of which is indicated not only by its specific reference to a particular city,<sup>10</sup> but also by its anaphora at the head of three successive cola. Indeed, the occurrence of *ibi* with impersonal *habet* in this passage is largely fortuitous<sup>11</sup> and fails in any case to prove that *ibi habet* had solidified even as late as the A.D. 500s.

In the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, however, there is a significant example of *ibi habet* + acc. which, though rendered correctly in more than one translation, otherwise appears to have gone unnoticed (e.g., in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*<sup>12</sup>). This example, moreover, dates to the late 300s, and thus it establishes that the exact Latin equivalent of *il y a* is in fact coeval with impersonal *habet* without *ibi*, even if, to be sure, the latter is considerably more common. The passage in question is this in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 4. 4:

In eo ergo loco, licet et lectum non sit, tamen petra ingens est per girum habens planitiem supra se, in qua stetisse dicuntur ipsi sancti; nam et in medio ibi quasi altarium de lapidibus factum habet.

<sup>9</sup> Walther von Wartburg, *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 4 (Basel 1952), 364. Presumably this is true of Portuguese also, even though modern Portuguese *ha* is unique in preserving *habet* + acc. without *ibi*.

<sup>10</sup> Viz. Livia, visited by Egeria in 10. 4–7. The anaphora of *ibi* in Theodosius is reminiscent of the string of five sentences in succession which Egeria introduces with the phrase *Hic est locus ubi* or some variant thereof. The reminiscence can hardly be coincidental.

<sup>11</sup> The clause-position of *habet* immediately after *ibi* (cf. *transivit*, *lavit*, and *curantur* in final position) may be due to the tendency of mono- and dissyllabic forms of common verbs to fall into enclitic position. See Jacob Wackernagel, *Indo-Germ. Forsch.* 1 (1892), pp. 95–97 = *Kleine Schriften* 1<sup>2</sup> (Göttingen, 1969), pp. 427–29; Raphael Kühner and Carl Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* 2<sup>2</sup> (Hanover 1912), p. 602; J. B. Hofmann and Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965), pp. 404–06.

<sup>12</sup> S.v. *habeo*, col. 2461. 78 – 2462. 11.

To paraphrase: "In that place, even though no passage of Scripture referring to it is read, there is a large round rock which is flat on top. There [i.e., on the flat summit] the holy ones are said to have stood [= resided?], and<sup>13</sup> in the middle of that space there is a sort of altar made of stones."

What is the subject of *habet* at the end of this passage? To judge from the silence of Löfstedt and others, *petra ingens* is understood as its subject, and hence *habet* is not impersonal. This analysis, however, is mistaken for at least three reasons:

1. The rock *habet planitiem supra se*, and this *planities*, in turn, *in medio altarium habet*. Thus, if *habet* has a subject, that subject is *planities*, not *petra*. Earlier in the clause, however, demonstrative *ibi* is equivalent to *in planitie*, and hence *planities* also is eliminated as subject of *habet*.
2. In the relative clause and all that follows it, Egeria is concerned solely with the *planities*. Even in her nonchalant prose, to return abruptly to the *petra* in the final word in the sentence would require at the very least a pronominal reference to that effect.
3. Egeria has a penchant for losing the syntactical thread established at the beginning of a sentence. Indeed, this is so marked a characteristic of her writing that anacolutha are ubiquitous in the *Itinerarium*. The following examples are both typical and similar in structure to the sentence under discussion:

. . . ita tamen ut lapis cum corpore non moveretur in alio loco sed ibi ubi inventum fuerat corpus positum esset. . . . (16. 6)

Here the insertion of the relative clause *ubi inventum fuerat corpus* is sufficient to cause the authoress to forget *lapis*, which is the grammatical subject of both verbs in the antithesis. She thus writes *positum* instead of *positus*.

Nam ecclesia quam dixi foras civitatem . . . , ubi fuit primitus domus Abrahae, nunc et martyrium ibi positum est. . . . (20. 5)

After two relative clauses *ecclesia* is forgotten and left without any grammatical connection with the rest of the sentence—a so-called "nominativus pendens."

Tunc statim illi sancti dignati sunt singula ostendere. Nam ostenderunt nobis speluncam illam ubi fuit sanctus Moyses cum iterato ascendisset in montem Dei ut acciperet denuo tabulas, posteaquam priores illas

<sup>13</sup> In the combination of continuative *nam* and *et* = *etiam*, which occurs occasionally in Cicero and very often (26 times) in Egeria, *et* is otiose.

fregerat peccante populo, et cetera loca, quaecumque desiderabamus vel quae ipsi melius noverant, dignati sunt ostendere nobis. (3. 7)

The grammatical subject of both sentences is *illi sancti*, but the digression on the Sinai cave is of such length and complexity that a return to this subject has to be signaled with *ipsi*, and *ostenderunt nobis* preceding the digression, by now forgotten, is subsequently repeated as *dignati sunt ostendere nobis*.

For these reasons, to return to the passage before us, neither *petra* nor *planities* can be the subject of *habet*. This verb is rather the impersonal *habet* which, occurring twice elsewhere (1. 2 and 23. 2) in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, eventually became firmly established in several Romance languages.<sup>14</sup> In this passage, moreover, is found the *ibi* which, though presupposed by all Romance expressions except Portuguese *ha*, nevertheless occurs in only one of the Latin examples heretofore identified.

Thus, impersonal *ibi habet* + acc., the exact Latin equivalent of French *il y a* etc., is unambiguously attested as early as the late 300s. This *terminus post quem* is more than a century earlier than that previously established, and no later than the earliest examples of the same construction without *ibi*. To judge from its use in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, moreover, impersonal *ibi habet* + acc. is subject to the same conditions in Late Latin as govern its use in primeval Romance. There the adverb always refers to a specific place, and thus it is not used if such a place is otherwise indicated, or if extent of time is referred to.<sup>15</sup> Correspondingly, in *Itinerarium Egeriae* 4. 4 *ibi* refers specifically to the *planities* atop the *petra ingens*, but in 1. 2 and 23. 2, where *habet* indicates extent of space (the logical and usual antecedent of extent of time), *ibi* is not to be found.

### III. *Ac Tertia Die* (6. 1, 23. 1)

It is typical of Egeria's repetitious style of writing that in chapters 1–23 there is a certain sentence-pattern which recurs no fewer than seven times. The pattern in question consists of these elements in this order:

<sup>14</sup> There is no weight in the objection that, so soon after *habens planitiem* earlier in the sentence, *habere* is unlikely to be repeated in a different sense. In 27. 5, for example, *similiter* is used as a sentence-connective = "likewise," only to be followed four words later by the adverb *similiter* = "in the same way." In 21. 1 *locus* recurs three times within two sentences, and each time in a different sense: first "passage of Scripture," then "place," and finally, as the adverb *loco*, "there."

<sup>15</sup> Wartburg, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* 4:364.

- A. Clause-initial sentence-connective, whether word or phrase (followed once by an enclitic personal pronoun)
- B. Ablative *die* preceded by an ordinal numeral (*alia* = *secunda*)
- C. Participial clause (missing in two cases)
- D. Perfect active indicative of *rogo*, *venio*, or *pervenio* in the first person.

Without exception in chapters 1–23 every sentence that contains an ordinal numeral + *die* conforms to this pattern, viz.,

1. Et alia die, maturius vigilantes, rogavimus (4. 8)
2. Et inde alia die, subiens montem Taurum et faciens iter iam notum per . . . , perveni (23. 7)
3. Inde denuo alia die, facientes aquam et euntes adhuc aliquantulum inter montes, pervenimus (6. 1)
4. Ac tertia die, inde maturantes, venimus (6. 1)
5. Ac tertia die perveni (23. 1)
6. Ac sic ergo alia die, transiens mare, perveni (23. 8)
7. Ac sic ergo nos alia die mane rogavimus (16. 7).

It is noteworthy that although they conform to type in all other respects (only the absence of a participial clause in no. 5 is at all anomalous), the two citations containing *tertia die* differ from all others in respect to element A. In all other citations this element is subject to some variation. Indeed, only *ac sic ergo* occurs more than once, and it is common throughout the *Itinerarium*, occurring 31 times in all. In both cases, however, of *tertia die*, far separated though they are in the text, *ac* functions as element A. If this fact *per se* is not particularly remarkable, it surely becomes so when considered together with the general incidence of *ac/atque* in the *Itinerarium*. As part of the fixed expressions *ac sic ergo*, *ac sic*, and *ac si*,<sup>16</sup> this conjunction occurs 53 times. In four other cases it connects syntactically parallel pairs in three-word phrases like *virī ac feminae*.<sup>17</sup> Otherwise *ac/atque* is

<sup>16</sup> That *ac* had no semantic autonomy ("valence") in these expressions is especially clear in the case of *ac si*, the eventual univerbation of which is indicated by its Romance descendants: Old French *eissi*, Provençal *aissi*, Spanish *así*, and Portuguese *assim*.

<sup>17</sup> To this category, by way of comparison, belong 28 of 36 instances of *ac* in Tertullian's *Apologeticum* and *De anima*. In its other eight occurrences *ac* is part of a formula (*ac per hoc* three times, *rursus ac rursus* twice, and *novus ac novus*, *ac si*, and *semel [sic] ac* once each).

Aside from one instance of *simul atque* and four of *alius atque alius*, all the occurrences of *atque* in these texts fall into the same two categories as in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*: three-word phrases like *illuminator atque deductor*, composed of two syntactically parallel (and often morphologically identical) words joined by *atque* (47 examples).

found only four times, not including daggered *atque* in 27. 5. Thus, of the apparently unrestricted use of *ac/atque* there are only four examples, and in half of them this rare conjunction is part of the phrase *ac tertia die* falling at the beginning of a sentence.<sup>18</sup> Conversely, these two instances of *ac tertia die* amount to half of all occurrences of *tertia die*.<sup>19</sup>

If it is reasonable to ask why an otherwise rare conjunction is found in both of the above citations in which *tertia die* occurs, at least one need not wonder why *ac* is in general not part of Egeria's active vocabulary. Since ample documentation already exists concerning the formal, literary tone of *ac/atque* as compared with *et* in particular,<sup>20</sup> here a few statistical data will suffice. In Cato's speeches *ac/atque* is common, but rare in the *De agricultura*. In Cicero too it is commonest in the speeches. In the pseudo-Caesarian *Bellum Hispaniense* it is limited to a single instance of *ac si*. The same is true of the vernacular passages in Petronius, but in the verse passages, meager by comparison, *ac/atque* occurs no fewer than 30 times. It is rare in Vitruvius, the phrase *dextra ac sinistra* (cf. Egeria's *virī ac feminae* etc.) accounting for half of all examples, and rare as well in Commodian and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*. In Phaedrus, with one possible exception, it is limited to *simul ac*, and among the inscriptions found at Pompeii before 1911 there are no examples at all. This statistical evidence of the early obsolescence of *ac/atque* appears corroborated, moreover, by the following remark of an admirer of Cato in Fronto *Epistulae* 2. 16:

Uni M. Porcio me dedicavi atque despondi atque delegavi. Hoc etiam ipsum "atque" unde putas?<sup>21</sup>

---

and formulae composed of *atque* and an adverb or conjunction (*atque adeo* and *atque ita* [cf. Egeria's *ac sic* and *ac sic ergo*] nine times each, *atque exinde* three times, and *atque inde* [cf. Egeria's *et inde* above], *atque illic*, and *atque utinam* once each). It is noteworthy that the phonology of these two categories conforms to entirely different norms. In the formulae constituting the second category, the word following *atque* begins with a vowel in all 24 instances without exception, but among the 47 examples belonging to the first category, this is the case in no more than seven. This striking discrepancy demonstrates that the expressions belonging to the second category are all formulae inherited from the time when *atque* was generally restricted to use before words beginning with a vowel. Finally, *ac* is never used at the beginning of a sentence (cf. Egeria's practice), but *atque* appears 13 times in this position.

<sup>18</sup> In the other half *atque* is found, viz., in 18. 1 and 21. 1.

<sup>19</sup> The other two are in 25. 11 and 49. 3, and only in the latter at the beginning of a sentence (*Item tertia die*).

<sup>20</sup> For particulars see Hofmann and Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax*, pp. 476–78 and the bibliography cited there.

<sup>21</sup> It is not impossible, however, that the Catonism in question here is not the use of *ac/atque* per se, but rather the particular use of *atque* before consonants, for which see

It is clear enough, then, why *ac/atque* does not belong to Egeria's active vocabulary. Why, then, in both of its occurrences above, is *tertia die* in particular preceded by this formal, literary, and even vaguely grandiloquent conjunction, which otherwise is used without restriction in only two places in the entire text? The answer follows from the nature of the conjunction itself. If *ac/atque* is a word unique to the written language, then *ac tertia die* is likely to be a quotation or a paraphrase, even if unconscious, of some written text with which the authoress is familiar.<sup>22</sup> In the vernacular, moreover, as has just been shown, *ac/atque* had long been virtually extinct and must therefore, by Egeria's day, have had a distinctly archaic ring. This consideration leads to a liturgical text as the likeliest source of *ac tertia die*, for however unaffected and straightforward the Latin of Christian writers may have been, the language of Christian worship was quite another matter.

... Latin used in the liturgy displays a sacral style. The basis and starting point of Liturgical Latin is the Early Christian idiom, which, however, ... has taken on a strongly hieratic character, widely removed from the Christian colloquial language. ... Liturgical Latin is not Classical Latin, but neither is it, as is so often said, the Latin which was considered decadent by educated people. The earliest liturgical Latin is a strongly stylized, more or less artificial language, of which many elements ... were not easily understood even by the average Christian of the fifth century or later. This language was far removed from that of everyday life.<sup>23</sup>

"And on the third day. . . ." Even for a believer less thoroughly steeped in Scripture and liturgy than Egeria, it would have been a natural reflex to express this idea by using the elevated expression with which many a sacred text must have referred to this central event in the life of Christ, and in the belief of Christians everywhere. As far as Egeria in particular is concerned, her propensity for adopting

---

Bertil Axelsson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945), pp. 82–85, and J. A. Richmond, *Glotta* 43 (1965), 78–103, esp. 80, 82, 93–94. *Me dedicavi ac despondi ac delegavi* might have occasioned no comment, at least not concerning the conjunction.

<sup>22</sup> In this connection it is significant that in 18. 1, one of the two instances of the free use of *ac/atque* just mentioned, *atque* is followed immediately by a Biblicism drawn from Deut. 28:11, for which see below.

<sup>23</sup> Christine Mohrmann, *Liturgical Latin: Its Origins and Character* (London 1959), pp. 53–54.



Scriptural and liturgical modes of expression has been well documented.<sup>24</sup> To cite only a few among many examples, the phrases *in nomine Dei*, which she uses five times, *iubente Deo*, occurring eight times, and *gratias agentes Deo*, found once (in 16. 7), are all formulae of prayer which have become part of Egeria's normal pattern of speech. When she mentions Biblical Egypt in 5. 9, she calls it *terra Aegypti*, its designation in the Vulgate and in her own quotation of Gen. 47:6 in 7. 9. Contemporary Egypt, however, she calls simply *Aegyptum* in 3. 8 and 7. 1, for example. In 4. 2, referring to the flight of Elijah from King Ahab, she adopts the Biblicism *fugere a facie* + gen., which, since it occurs at least four times in the Vulgate translation of the Psalms, Ziegler<sup>25</sup> has suggested was familiar to Egeria from its frequency in the pages of her psalter. Yet another example has heretofore gone unnoticed. In 18.1, writing of her stopover in Hierapolis in Syria, she characterizes that city as *abundans omnibus* and thus adopts the phraseology of the Vulgate at Deut. 28:11.<sup>26</sup>

In short, quite apart from explicit references to specific passages of Scripture, Biblical turns of phrase so permeate the *Itinerarium Egeriae* that they have left their stamp on the language of the entire work. In many cases, moreover, Egeria's familiarity with these Biblicisms will have been indirect, due more to their occurrence in her liturgy than to her own Scriptural erudition.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, whether she is quoting a specific text or, as is more likely, using an expression

<sup>24</sup> "Elle fait usage d'un certain langage dévot, caractérisé par des expressions plus ou moins onctueuses, empruntées à la Bible, soit aux textes rebattus de la liturgie"—A. A. R. Bastiaensen, *Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans L'Itinéraire d'Égérie* (Nijmegen 1962), p. 181. See also Joseph Ziegler, *Biblica* 12 (1931), 163–64, 176–77, 184–85, 190 ("Neben den direkten Zitaten des Alten Testaments begegnen uns in der Peregrinatio noch viele freie Anspielungen und biblische Wendungen, die den ganzen Sprachcharakter des Büchleins nachhaltig beeinflusst haben"—p. 176).

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 177.

<sup>26</sup> "Abundare te faciet Dominus omnibus bonis." With *abundare omnibus* here cf. *abundare in omnibus* (Eccles. 10:30, 11 Cor. 1:7) and *abundare in omne* (11 Cor. 9:8, 9:11). This and other correspondences between Egeria's language and the text of the Vulgate should not, however, be taken to imply that the Vulgate and Egeria's Bible are one and the same. On the contrary, direct quotations from her Bible indicate that the latter, like the Itala in general, was more similar to the Septuagint than to any other extant text. In quotations from the New Testament she comes much closer to the Vulgate, but that is because there Jerome by and large preserved the text of the Itala. See *ibid.* 165, 167, 187, 197.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 177, 184–85, 188, 190.

common to a multitude of texts with reference to the Resurrection of Christ, in neither case can it be known precisely what this text or these texts may have been.<sup>28</sup>

*Kenyon College*

<sup>28</sup> In the Vulgate New Testament the phrase *et tertia die* (in Luke 24:7, *et die tertia*) occurs in eight places (Matt. 16:21, 17:22, and 20:19, Luke 9:22, 13:32, and 18:33, John 2:1, and Acts 27:19), and in five of these it refers to the Resurrection. There is no instance of *ac* in place of *et*, however, either in the Vulgate or in the Itala. Tertullian and Irenaeus are the only Latin fathers who quote any of the above verses (Luke 9:22 in Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 4. 21. 7 [*et post tertium diem*] and Irenaeus *Adv. haereses* 3. 16. 5 [*et die tertio*], and Matt. 16:21 *ibid.* 3. 18. 4 [*et tertia die*]), and there also only *et* is found.

In the Roman missal *tertia dies* with reference to the Resurrection occurs only in the creed, which has *et resurrexit tertia die*. In all other extant creeds, however, there is no conjunction at all. In the Leonine Sacramentary *tertia dies* does not occur. Finally, in the supplements to the *Corpus Christianorum* entitled "Instrumenta lexicologica Latina," no parallel for Egeria's *ac tertia die* is to be found.